

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIANOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES**FILED**

MAY 15 2008

CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
Deputy Clerk Office
DEPUTY

TO: U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Sabraw
 FROM: K.Hammerly, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 5/14/2008
 CASE NO.: 07cv2388 DOCUMENT FILED BY: Plaintiff Fox
 CASE TITLE: Fox v. United States of America, et al
 DOCUMENT ENTITLED: Plaintiffs Brief of Facts

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local Rule	Discrepancy
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
<input type="checkbox"/> 5.4	Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
<input type="checkbox"/> 7.1	Missing table of contents
<input type="checkbox"/> 15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
<input type="checkbox"/> 30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
X	Supplemental documents require court order
<input type="checkbox"/>	Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>OTHER:</u>

Date forwarded: 5/14/2008ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.
 The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers

ECL

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: Judge SabrawBy: MHDated: 5/15/08
cc: All Parties

REJECTED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

MICHAEL FOX

PLAINTIFF

CASE NUMBER 07 CV 2388 DMS (POR)

VERSES

United States of America ET AL

PLAINTIFFS BRIEF OF FACTS

DEFENDANTS

NOW COMES MICHAEL FOX THE PLAINTIFF IN PRO PER AND STATES THE
BRIEF OF FACTS TO THIS HONORABLE COURT

1) DEFENDANTS CONTINUE TO LIVE IN THEIR SELF-CENTERED WORLD OF DELUSIONAL DENIAL. DEFENDANTS
CONTINUE TO ASK THIS COURT TO SAVE THE DEFENDANTS IN THEIR GROSS MISCONDUCT IN HANDLING
THIS PETITION AND COMPLAINT AND ITS EXHIBITS... CONTINUING TO STATE FALSE ALLEGATIONS, WHEN
DEFENDANTS ARE IN DEFAULT..

1A) PLAINTIFF FILED A PETITION AND COMPLAINT WITH A HUGE AMOUNT OF EXHIBITS ON DEC 20 2008 IN THE
FEDERAL COURT CLERKS OFFICE.

2) DEFENDANTS BEING SERVED DEC 28 2007 AND JAN 4 2008

2A) DEFENDANTS HAD UNTIL FEB 25 2008 TO ANSWER THIS PETITION AND COMPLAINT--

2B) ON FEB 26 2008 DEFENDANTS FILE FOR AN EXPARTE MOTION TO THE COURT FOR A EXTENSION OF TIME,
DEFENDANTS STATING THEY NEED MORE TIME DUE TO THE COMPLEXITY OF THIS CASE, AND TO DUE A
GOOD AND THOURAL JOB ANSWERING THE ISSUES. ALSO DUE TO 1ST AMMENDED COMPLAINT WHICH
GRANTS THE DEFENDANTS ADDTITIONAL TIME TO FILE--PLAINTFFS 1ST AMENDDED COMPLAINT WAS IN
REFERENCE TO A STAGED CAR WRECK IN GALVISTON TEXAS WITH NON OF THE PETITIONED DEFENDANTS
NAMES ON IT.